



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,082	02/13/2002	Anthony C. Parra		7564
30406	7590	06/12/2007	EXAMINER	
ROBERT L. MARSH			HOTALING, JOHN M	
54 DANADA DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 4468			3714	
WHEATON, IL 60187-4468				

  

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

**MAILED**

Application Number: 10/075,082

[JUN 12 2007]

Filing Date: February 13, 2002

Group 3700

Appellant(s): PARRA ET AL.

Robert L. Marsh  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/10/2006 appealing from the Office action  
mailed 11/26/2004.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows:

**NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION**

There is a new 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph new matter rejection of the amendments to claims 1, 10 and the specification as set forth in section 9 below.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 3714

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5,726,706	WALSH	03-1998
3,643,345	WILTON	02-1972
5,971,271	WYNN et al	10-1999
6,270,404	SINES et al	08-2001
5,839,960	PARRA	11-1998
6,154,131	JONES II	11-2000
6,299,534	BREEDING et al	10-2001

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

The previous rejections are maintained and incorporated and copied herein.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US Patent No. 5,726,706) in view of Wilton et al. (US Patent No. 3,643,345).

Walsh discloses a casino game station that has a table including an upper surface (FIG

i, reference 25) wherein though Walsh does not explicitly disclose so, the table axiomatically has marking thereon for use in the playing of a game of chance wherein a plurality of playing stations are designated for each player to participate in a game of chance. Further a dealer station would also be axiomatic. Walsh also discloses a canopy extending from a vertical extension wherein the canopy is placed. Inside the canopy is disposed a motion video camera positioned towards the upper surface to record the playing of the game being played on the upper surface of the table (Column 1, lines 45-47). Though Walsh does disclose a canopy member extending from a vertical support of the ceiling, the exact format as claimed by the applicant is not disclosed. In an analogous piece of prior art that solves the same problem as Applicant with having a camera mounted over a table, Wilton et al. teaches and suggests an alternative method for supporting a camera used to record footage from a table with an upper surface (1). Wilton et al. teaches a pedestal that includes a base member (5) and a unitary member extending vertically from the base until an upper end, the part above (5), see figure 1. At the upper end, a horizontal member (4), the second portion, extends until an upper end wherein a "canopy" (2) containing the camera (3) is disposed, in this case the "canopy" is the camera's housing and the camera is the optical system (3). Both members are fixedly attached thereto as they can firmly be set in position. They are attached in a manner that they are fixed to their bases as they cannot be readily removed or unattached. Though they may be pivoted, they are still fixedly attached as they are not removable from the system and are thus fixed to it. Further, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan that when employing the structure into the system of Walsh

Art Unit: 3714

that a casino would not require the movement and hinging that a movie studio would and that the crane could become integral and still serve the functions required by the casino, thus making it entirely fixable would be obvious to a skilled artisan who would be motivated by the environment and requirements for usage in a casino. A skilled artisan would thoroughly understand these limitations and requirements and would be motivated to design devices to adhere and enhance them and thus making the crane entirely fixed would be obvious to such an artisan to make the device more readily usable in a casino.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the structural means of Wilton et al. into the system of Walsh. The means in which the camera is mounted is a design choice, and absent a showing of criticality would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In the incorporation of the Wilton et al. design into the system of Walsh, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the camera would be disposed in a canopy as it is disclosed by Walsh that monitoring should be unobtrusive Column i, lines 41-42). Further, it would obvious to use the boom system of Wilton et al. as opposed to solely mounting the camera on the ceiling as is known in the art and also disclosed by Walsh that monitoring should be concealed as well as be at a close distance to the table. Thus by using a boom system with a canopy as a design alternative, a system where the camera would be unobtrusive to the user and still within an acceptable distance to the table would be achieved. Absent from the fact that the boom system is a very obvious design choice of one in the art, one of ordinary skill in

the art would be further motivated to employ the crane system as it would allow for a better positions of the camera as well as the ability to incorporate a camera with more features as using the boom would inherently provide more room to store the camera, thus allowing larger more powerful cameras.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US Patent No. 5,726,706) in view of Wilton et al. (US Patent No. 3,643,345) et al. (US Patent No. 5,971,271).

What Walsh and Wilton et al. disclose, teach, and/or suggest has been discussed above and is incorporated herein further in view of Wynn.

Walsh does not disclose a headset for the dealer in order to be connected to a supervisor. However, it is well known in the art that dealers are in constant communication with their supervisors in order to keep an order to the game as well as for contact in case of arising situations. Wynn et al. disclose incorporating an audio channel between a user and a central location manned by those who can communicate with the user in order to provide assistance (Abstract). Though Wynn et al. disclose this functionality to assist the players, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately recognize the functionality disclosed by the headset device could be equally adaptive to a table game in order to keep the dealer in communication with supervisors. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the dealer at the table as disclosed by Walsh et al. with such a headset in order to allow the dealer to

Art Unit: 3714

communicate audio messages to the supervisor who is viewing the feed of the camera to not only provide the supervisor with more information relating to the game but to also receive instructions from the supervisor as how to handle situations the supervisor may see arising. This would increase the security of the table already present by the camera thus creating an even greater means to ensure the integrity of the game within the casino.

Claims 4, 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US Patent No. 5,726,706) in view of Wilton et al. (US Patent No. 3,643,345) further in view of Sines et al. (US Patent No. 6,270,404).

What Walsh and Wilton et al. disclose, teach, and/or suggest has been discussed above and is incorporated herein.

Walsh and Wilton et al. do not disclose incorporating a means to display information in their systems.

Sines et al. disclose using a monitor for displaying the game to the user as the user plays (FIG 2). These monitors show the contents of the game to the players by substituting for actual cards. Further, during idle times in the game, the monitors are used to display advertising material to the players (Column 17, lines 32-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the display means of Sines et al. into the system of Walsh et al. wherein instead of displaying the cards to the player as disclosed by Sines et al. the system of Walsh et al. would broadcast that which is being filmed. It is notoriously well known in the art that the filmed data from the

Art Unit: 3714

camera is broadcast for viewing. By incorporating the teaching of Sines et al. involving using monitors at the gaming table, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that these monitors could also be used not only to enhance security in games where cards are replaced, but also be used to enhance security in games where cards are not replaced by displaying the taped game to the users. By doing this, the users would be more aware of what is going on around them and would be more inclined to detect and report mischievous acts as such acts could directly affect them. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to incorporate the filmed data from an actual card game into the monitor of Sines et al. as by involving a greater number of people in the security of the system, the casino security would get a lot more exposure thus becoming more effective. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to mount this monitor on the pedestal apparatus as disclosed by Wilton et al. because when the monitor would be displaying advertising material as disclosed by Sines et al. it would reach a greater amount of people in the casino as opposed to just the players of the table game thus enhancing the value of the advertisement. The placement of the monitor would be a design choice and it would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Additionally, one of ordinary skill in the art would be further motivated to mount the monitor in a higher position, such as the number of mounting positions axiomatically available on the Wilton et al. crane, as it would then be able to be broadcast to a number of people instead of just the user at the playing station. In addition to advertising displays, one of ordinary skill in the art would further understand that by mounting the displays at a higher position as disclosed above to broadcast the camera signal, a

Art Unit: 3714

greater number of patrons/employees would be encompassed in monitoring security as the feed from the game would be broadcast to the entire viewing area thus greatly discouraging cheaters as they would feel more likely to be caught.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US Patent No. 5,726,706) in view of Wilton et al. (US Patent No. 3,643,345) further in view of Parra et al. (US Patent No. 5,839,960).

What Walsh and Wilton et al. disclose, teach, and/or suggest has been discussed above and is incorporated herein.

Because the disclosure of Walsh is related to the security features of the gaming table and not the table itself, Walsh does not explicitly disclose a socket for use with a telephone for patrons. Parra et al. disclose a gaming table that incorporates a telephone into the table in order to provide the players with the opportunity to make or receive calls, make reservations, etc. without having to leave the table (Column 12, lines 30-67). By making this incorporation, each player can be provided with the convenience of being in contact with those not at the table, but not have to leave their spot at the table in order to do so. One of ordinary skill in the art would thus be motivated to make this incorporation into the system of Walsh, as it is disclosed by Parra et al. that player convenience is thus enhanced and thus the player will not be forced to move from their spot at the table in order to take care of business issues. Further, such a design choice would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is known in the art that sometimes players wait a long time to achieve their spots as well as the fact that players

Art Unit: 3714

may think that their current spot is lucky. Thus, by allowing players to make contact with others without having to leave the table as disclosed by Parra et al. the players enjoyment would be greatly increased and the player would be more likely to stay at their position and thus place more bets likely to generate even more revenue for the casino.

Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US Patent No. 5,726,706) in view of Wilton et al. (US Patent No. 3,643,345) further in view of Jones, II et al. (US Patent No. 6,154,131).

What Walsh and Wilton et al. disclose, teach, and/or suggest has been discussed above and is incorporated herein.

Walsh does not disclose what becomes of the video that is taped from the cameras disposed in the canopy. However, it is notoriously well known in the art that when surveillance cameras are being used to monitor gaming tables, the feed from the camera is sent to a remote video display for observation by a supervisor. Jones, II et al. support this fact as it is disclosed that video surveillance requires a human element that must always be present and evaluate the actions of the persons at the gaming table as taped by the optical security system.

Therefore, it is obvious to the system of Walsh that a remote video display is connected to the video camera wherein a human element must be monitoring the feed in order to detect cheating and/or other mischievous acts.

Claims 8-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US Patent No. 5,726,706) in view of Wilton et al. (US Patent No. 3,643,345) further in view of Breeding et al. (US Patent No. 6,299,534).

What Walsh and Wilton et al. disclose, teach, and/or suggest has been discussed above and is incorporated herein.

Walsh and Wilton et al. do not disclose a tray in accordance with the pedestal in which the tray can be fitted with a retainer for retaining extra chips.

Dealer stations are notoriously well known in the art as assistance means to provide the dealer with extra paraphernalia that may be required in the game. Such stations are known to include extra chip retainers. These caddies can be associated with the table or movable from table to table.

Breeding et al. disclose such a type of caddy (FIG 1) that provides the dealer with supplemental functionality in addition to what can be stored at the table. Though Breeding et al. do not explicitly disclose that a chip retainer is held in the station, such an incorporation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as it is notoriously well known that every dealer needs sets of chips to properly handle wagers and that the chips can be used at a relatively fast pace, thus supplying an extra retainer would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, it would have been obvious as a design choice to mount the tray at a location other than on the actual gaming table. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand the location to which the station is mounted is not critical and thus obvious as long as it is in a position of easy accessibility

Art Unit: 3714

by the dealer. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the station on the crane as provided by Wilton et al. as the station would still be easily accessible by the dealer. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to mount the tray on the crane as there is plenty of area available on the crane and by moving the tray there, the area of the table would not be thus crowded and special adaptations would not be required to the table which is known to be constantly changed. By incorporating the dealer station in the stationary crane device, it would not become a concern when the table top is being serviced, as the felt is often changed in addition to the actual game as is notoriously well known in the art.

### **NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 10, and the amendments to the specification are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 10 and the specification page 6 were amended on 8/13/2004.

There is no support in the original specification to support the amended specification

Art Unit: 3714

and claims. Nowhere in the specification is there a provision for a unitary member having a first portion and/or a second portion attached thereto. Indeed, the use of a first and a second portion teach away from a unitary member. Even if the examiner were to consider a unitary member as statutory the specification on page 3 teaches away from any specific structure by stating that "... the post 52 and the extension 54 may have any of a number of configurations within the spirit of the invention." The claims have been previously been examined and rejected with the basis that the structure that holds the canopy and the cameras is an obvious matter of choice and therefore not patentable. The examiner has no problem with the inclusion of the word "however" in the second paragraph of page 6 of the specification.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

The response will be numbered the same as the applicant's arguments.

I(a) and I(b): Applicant argues that the novelty of the invention is with respect to the unitary member support. The examiner maintains that the combination of the references the rejection above teach a pedestal with a arm that can be set in a fixed position over a table to mount equipment such as cameras. Though Walsh does disclose a canopy member extending from a vertical support of the ceiling, the exact format as claimed by the applicant is not disclosed. In an analogous piece of prior art that solves the same problem as Applicant with having a camera mounted over a table, Wilton et al. teaches and suggests an alternative method for supporting a camera used to record footage from a table with an upper surface (1). Wilton et al. teaches a pedestal

Art Unit: 3714

that includes a base member (5) and a unitary member extending vertically from the base until an upper end, the part above (5), see figure 1. At the upper end, a horizontal member (4), the second portion, extends until an upper end wherein a "canopy" (2) containing the camera (3) is disposed, in this case the "canopy" is the camera's housing and the camera is the optical system (3). Both members are fixedly attached thereto as they can firmly be set in position. They are attached in a manner that they are fixed to their bases as they cannot be readily removed or unattached. Though they may be pivoted, they are still fixedly attached as they are not removable from the system and are thus fixed to it. Further, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan that when employing the structure into the system of Walsh that a casino would not require the movement and hinging that a movie studio would and that the crane could become integral and still serve the functions required by the casino, thus making it entirely fixable would be obvious to a skilled artisan who would be motivated by the environment and requirements for usage in a casino. A skilled artisan would thoroughly understand these limitations and requirements and would be motivated to design devices to adhere and enhance them and thus making the crane entirely fixed would be obvious to such an artisan to make the device more readily usable in a casino. Additionally there is no support in the specification for the use of a unitary member as outlined above in the new matter rejection. With respect to the appellant's arguments relative to In re Gordon that one cannot modify a device in a manner that renders it unsuited for its intended purpose the examiner would point out that the use of the reference to Wilton is for a teaching that it is known to have a support structure with a base and a arm supported over a

Art Unit: 3714.

table that is equipped with a camera and not for the specific teaching of using it for simulating the movement of an aircraft. With respect to the declaration of Anthony Parra the examiner notes that since using cameras is well known in a casino and for other security systems the placement and mounting of a camera above a table using an arm and a base is taught as outlined above. Additionally, mounting of security cameras anywhere seems to be an obvious matter of choice by the designer of the security system. Some considerations such as does the designer want the camera visible, so that people know that they are being watch or invisible so as to spy on an individual must be taken into consideration for camera placement. The use of surveillance systems and specifically cameras in a casino are so notoriously well known that specific placement of such cameras are based on system design and as such are a matter of choice.

II. The appellant argues that claim 2 is patentable over the combination of Walsh in view of Wilton and further view of Wynn. Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and adds the limitation of "a headset for use by the dealer connected to a supervisor at a remote location to facilitate communication between the supervisor and said dealer". Applicant argues that the specific teaching of a "handset" rather than a "headset" is taught by Wynn and that the handset does no more than provide communication between a player and casino personnel. Applicant also argues that the specific teaching of communication between a dealer and a remote supervisor is not taught. Walsh does not disclose a headset for the dealer in order to be connected to a supervisor. However, it is well known in the art that dealers are in constant communication with their supervisors

in order to keep an order to the game as well as for contact in case of arising situations.

Wynn et al. disclose incorporating an audio channel between a user and a central location manned by those who can communicate with the user in order to provide assistance (Abstract). Though Wynn et al. disclose this functionality to assist the players, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately recognize the functionality disclosed by the handset device could be equally adaptive to a table game in order to keep the dealer in communication with supervisors. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the dealer at the table as disclosed by Walsh et al. with such a handset in order to allow the dealer to communicate audio messages to the supervisor who is viewing the feed of the camera to not only provide the supervisor with more information relating to the game but to also receive instructions from the supervisor as how to handle situations the supervisor may see arising. This would increase the security of the table already present by the camera thus creating an even greater means to ensure the integrity of the game within the casino. With respect to the specific communication between a dealer and a supervisor please see column 1 lines 10-15 where there is constant communication between the players and with the dealer or representative of the house. A representative of the house is commonly known as a pit boss and is the dealer's supervisor. Additionally Column 9 lines 15-23 that a supervisor may need to assist a player in matters that come up which are beyond the scope or authority of a concierge. The system of Wynn as a whole is to "provide meaningful interactive human communications with any equipped gaming device. Since players, dealers, and supervisors are all in communication as taught in column 1 outlined above,

one of ordinary skill in the art could easily ascertain that communication between players, dealers and supervisors could be done using teleconferencing. Appellant argues that a handset rather than a headset is taught. The examiner agrees that a handset is taught however, it is notoriously well known in the communications art that a handset and a headset can be interchanged and used for the same purpose of communicating. Both have a speaker and a microphone for receiving and transmitting communications between the users of the system and are therefore analogous.

III (a) Applicant argues that the display of Sines, however, cannot be used to project a view of the game as seen from the camera in the canopy overhead while the game is in fact in play because the videos of the Sines device are a fundamental element of the game itself. From the previous rejection the examiner maintains that Sines et al. discloses using a monitor for displaying the game to the user as the user plays (FIG 2). These monitors show the contents of the game to the players by substituting for actual cards. Further, during idle times in the game, the monitors are used to display advertising material to the players (Column 17, lines 32-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the display means of Sines et al. into the system of Walsh et al. wherein instead of displaying the cards to the player as disclosed by Sines et al. the system of Walsh et al. would broadcast that which is being filmed. It is notoriously well known in the art that the filmed data from the camera is broadcast for viewing. By incorporating the teaching of Sines et al. involving using monitors at the gaming table, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that these monitors could also be used not only to enhance security in games where

Art Unit: 3714

cards are replaced, but also be used to enhance security in games where cards are not replaced by displaying the taped game to the users. By doing this, the users would be more aware of what is going on around them and would be more inclined to detect and report mischievous acts as such acts could directly affect them. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to incorporate the filmed data from an actual card game into the monitor of Sines et al. as by involving a greater number of people in the security of the system, the casino security would get a lot more exposure thus becoming more effective. Furthermore, a display or monitor is capable of displaying live, advertisements attraction or any other filmed or computer generated footage.

(b) With respect to Appellant's argument that claim 4 stands or falls with claim 1 please see above.

IV. With respect to Appellant's argument that claim 5 stands or falls with claim 1 please see above.

V. With respect to Appellant's argument that claim 6 and 11 stands or falls with claim 1 please see above.

VI. Appellant state that claims 8, 9, 13, and 14 relate to a tray on the pedestal for retaining extra chips and the like used by the dealer. Appellant argues that the breeding reference has been cited as disclosing a caddy that provides the dealer with supplemental functions and can be used as a storage table but that this is not a free

Art Unit: 3714

standing pedestal, but rather an extension to the table itself. The rejection states that dealer stations are notoriously well known in the art as assistance means to provide the dealer with extra paraphernalia that may be required in the game. Such stations are known to include extra chip retainers. These caddies can be associated with the table or movable from table to table. Breeding et al. disclose such a type of caddy (FIG 1) that provides the dealer with supplemental functionality in addition to what can be stored at the table. Though Breeding et al. do not explicitly disclose that a chip retainer is held in the station, such an incorporation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as it is notoriously well known that every dealer needs sets of chips to properly handle wagers and that the chips can be used at a relatively fast pace, thus supplying an extra retainer would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, it would have been obvious as a design choice to mount the tray at a location other than on the actual gaming table. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand the location to which the station is mounted is not critical and thus obvious as long as it is in a position of easy accessibility by the dealer. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the station on the crane as provided by Wilton et al. as the station would still be easily accessible by the dealer. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to mount the tray on the crane as there is plenty of area available on the crane and by moving the tray there, the area of the table would not be thus crowded and special adaptations would not be required to the table which is known to be constantly changed. By incorporating the dealer station in the stationary crane

Art Unit: 3714

device, it would not become a concern when the table top is being serviced, as the felt is often changed in addition to the actual game as is notoriously well known in the art.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section (9) above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid **sua sponte dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

**(1) Reopen prosecution.** Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

**(2) Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence, it shall be

Art Unit: 3714

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

John M Hotaling II

Primary Examiner 3714

**A Technology Center Director or designee must personally approve the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in section (9) above by signing below:**

Fred Schmidt

Director Technology Center 3700



FREDERICK R. SCHMIDT  
DIRECTOR  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Conferees:

Scott Jones, Primary Examiner Art Unit 3714

/Scott Jones/

Corbett Coburn, Primary Examiner Art Unit 3714

/Corbett Coburn/